

BEST AVAILABLE COPYREMARKSRequest for Reconsideration

Applicant has carefully considered the matters raised by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action but remains of the position that patentable subject matter is present. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's position based on the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

Claim Status

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10 and 11 are presented for further examination. Claims 4 and 9 have been canceled herein.

Claim 1 has been amended herein to add the limitations of Claim 4 and to recite that the ink jet recording apparatus uses an interleave image forming method such that the ink is composed of jetted ink having different exposure histories.

Claim 2 has been amended because of the amendments made to Claim 1.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Claim 6 has also been amended herein, like Claim 1, to add the limitations of Claim 9 and to recite an interleave image forming method is employed to form the image and the jetted ink has different exposure histories.

Claim 7 has been amended herein because of the amendments made to Claim 6.

Claims 10 and 11 have also been added herein. Claim 10 is similar to Claim 1 while Claim 11 is similar to Claim 6.

Support for the use of the interleave system and the jetted ink having different exposure histories can be found in the second full paragraph of page 7, the last paragraph of page 20 and the paragraph bridging pages 50 and 51.

The Present Invention

One of the novel aspects of the present invention is that the total amount of energy per unit area is constant, regardless of how many overlapping layers are deposited. Constant energy per unit area is achieved because the exposure intensity is adjusted depending on the number of overlapping layers that will be exposed. This aspect of the invention is demonstrated by comparing Inventive method 3 and Comparative method 6 in Tables

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

2 and 3 of the application (same interleave, pass frequency, carriage speed and relative image recording speed). Inventive method 3 forms an acceptable image because it has a total amount of energy per unit area of 200 (8 passes \times 25 intensity per pass). In contrast, Comparative method 6 forms an unacceptable image since it has a much higher total amount of energy per unit area of 800 (8 passes \times 100 intensity per pass). Thus, Tables 2 and 3 show that the total amount of energy that reaches each portion of the image must be considered. The total amount of energy is adjusted by changing the exposure intensity depending on the number of overlapping ink layers.

Rejection

Claims 1-9 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Kurashima in view of Mills.

Kurashima is cited to teach ejecting overlapping layers of ink using different recording modes. Mills has been cited to teach varying the exposure intensity of the radiation source by increasing/decreasing the number of pulses per second as the carriage accelerates/decelerates.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

In contrast to the present Invention, Mills changes the exposure energy depending on the carriage speed. In the present Invention, the intensity is varied depending on the number of overlapping ink layers. Respectfully, Mills does not teach or suggest that the total energy amount should be considered when overlapping layers are deposited on the recording medium.

Thus, Claims 1 and 6, as well as Claims 10 and 11, recite that an interleave image forming is employed and the ink deposited thereon has different exposure histories. The claims also recite that the amount of energy used is maintained nearly constant and independent of the recording speed.

Clearly, the claims as presented herein distinguish over the teachings of Kurashima in view of Mills since neither Kurashima or Mills teach or suggest the total amount of energy should be considered on overlapping layers that are deposited.

Since an additional independent claim has been added herein, PTO Form 2038, which is submitted with the RCE, includes the fee for one additional independent claim.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY**F. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Should any extensions of time or fees be necessary in order to maintain this Application in pending condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and authorization is given to debit Account # 02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By:

Donald C. Lucas

Donald C. Lucas, 31,275
Attorney for Applicant(s)
475 Park Avenue South, 15th Floor
New York, NY 10016
Tel. # 212-661-8000

DCL/mr